



Clipping as a Productive Word-Formation Process in Contemporary English

Liu Fangyu

Huizhou University, China

3121332805@qq.com

Received: 14 Dec 2025; Received in revised form: 13 Jan 2026; Accepted: 18 Jan 2025; Available online: 26 Jan 2026

©2026 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— This paper explores the phenomenon of clipping, a dynamic word-formation process in modern English, using a corpus-based approach. A corpus of 150 clipped patterns was collected systematically in the context of three types of communication: informal communication, electronic communication, and professional communication. This phenomenon is categorized using four structural patterns: back-clipping, fore-clipping, mid-clipping, and complex clipping. The data indicate that back-clipping is the most dominant form, which accounts for 68%, showing significant variation in productivity depending on the type of communication. Phonological analysis shows that 87% of the back-clipped words preserve the major stress pattern of the source word, which is in line with the principles of prosodic optimization. There is a unique pattern of clipping in electronic communication, where a few instances, such as *app*, *pic*, *blog*, have gained cross-register acceptability and institutional acceptance. This paper proposes that the productivity of clipping is determined by the interaction of the phonological structure, usage, semantic transparency, and sociolinguistic factors.



Keywords— clipping, corpus analysis, word-formation, morphology, register variation

I. INTRODUCTION

Word formation is essentially about how languages expand their lexical resources in order to keep up with new modes of speech and talk. And in this regard, one of the stand-out ways in which new words are formed in modern English is clipping, shortening an existing word but preserving meaning and grammatical structure in an efficient, convenient package.

This research takes a detailed, corpus-driven approach to the topic of clipping, employing 150 instances of clipping from among three communicative contexts. There are three aims of the research:

(1) To chart the distribution of different instances of

clipping across contemporary English;

(2) To examine the register distribution of clipping productivity;

(3) To identify the phonological and sociolinguistic constraints on the acceptability and conventionalization of clipped forms.

1.1 Theoretical Background: Clipping as a Word-Formation Process

The expansion of English word stock is made possible through the use of various word formation procedures; these can be classified as major and minor procedures. The major word formation procedures include suffixation, prefixation, compounding, blend forms, and word formation involving

the generation of new forms using rule-based models. The minor procedures include non-compositional procedures such as reduction, rearrangement, or categorial transformation. Bauer (1983) classifies clipping as a minor procedure and describes it as a "subtractive procedure in which new items are formed by phonological truncation rather than morpheme addition."^[2] Plag (2003) classifies clipping as "the systematic deletion of phonological material from pre-existing words," a minor procedure in word formation yet very productive in informal usage.^[7] Marchand (1969) highlights the subtractive over addition process of clipping, contrasting it with derivation. When clipped variants gain sufficient usage in speech and writing, lexicalization follows, with clipped variants becoming autonomous lexical entries rather than context-dependent shorten ages.^[5] Crystal (2008) points out that clipping is mainly found in colloquial dialects, with the goal of achieving efficiency and speed in communication without sacrificing semantic transparency. The extent of conventionalization is quite different in various clipped variants: while "bike" (bicycle) is fully lexicalized with register-neutral status, "prof" (professor) is marked for its use in informal contexts.^[4]

1.2 Structural Taxonomy of Clipping Types

The word Marchand (1969)^[5] defines a structural taxonomy of clipping with four types of clipping, which are differentiated on the basis of the site of phonological clipping. Back clipping, the most productive type of clipping in the English language, is the removal of the final syllable(s) with the retention of the first stressed syllable, as seen in "ad" (advertisement) and "exam" (examination). The prevalence of back-clipping correlates with English's predominant trochaic stress pattern, wherein initial syllables frequently bear primary stress and therefore maintain greater perceptual salience. **Fore-clipping** operates in the opposite direction, removing initial syllable(s) while retaining final portions, as in "phone" (telephone) and "bus" (omnibus). This type, though less frequent than back-clipping, occurs regularly with words of Greek or Latin origin featuring unstressed initial syllables. **Middle-clipping**, also termed syncope, eliminates medial segments while preserving initial and final material, producing forms such as "flu" (influenza). This type is relatively rare due to constraints on syllable deletion that maintain morphological

recognizability. **Complex-clipping** involves combinations of multiple truncation processes or the integration of clipping with other word-formation operations, as illustrated by "perm" (permanent wave). Bauer (1983)^[2] notes that these categorical boundaries are not absolute; ambiguous cases and hybrid forms demonstrate that clipping operates along a continuum rather than through discrete, mutually exclusive categories.

1.3 Register Variation and Sociolinguistic Dimensions

Clipped forms exhibit sharp divisions according to the status of speech variety. From the point of view of colloquial speech, fridge, dorm, or gym are spontaneous, unobtrusive shortcuts within the flow of informal conversation. McArthur (1992)^[6] traces such popularity from what they imply socially: "solidarity, being in-group, and the very immediacy of speech".

Digital communication turbocharged clipping, giving us app, pic, and convo, which verge on universals in computer-mediated communication. These gadget-anchored abbreviations have a way of spreading fast and often break out of their casual turf into wider acceptance.

Clipping is also common in professional and technical languages, though it perhaps more often adjusts to fit the needs of the specific field. Medical clipping-exam, lab, rehab-provides speedy inside-group shorthand. In academia, psych, bio, and chem clippings serve both economy and identity. Quirk et al. (1985)^[8] note that many clippings have pushed the boundaries of their register, with words such as phone and plane shifting from informal toward neutral-or even formal-showing just how fluid and shifting the lines between registers can be.

1.4 Factors Governing Clipping Productivity

In a nutshell, it is a tangled web of linguistic and socio-linguistic forces that determines which words get clipped and which clipped forms stick. Phonological shape of a word is one major constraint: clipping preserves the stressed syllables because they are more salient and hence more easily recognized. Cannon (1987)^[3] demonstrates that English clipping is drifting towards simple prosodic patterns-mostly one- or two-syllable units matching the English preferred word length.

How frequently a term is applied plays a huge role in the intensity of its clippings. High-frequency words are more susceptible to phonological trimming, as speakers seek to

save time with terms they apply quite often. Semantic transparency applies as well: the clearer the relationship between the clipped form and the original word, the more it is accepted. For instance, "bike" from the term bicycle reads out as clear, while "flu" from the term influenza is not that transparent, which may make people wary of it, unless you already know the relationship of the clipping.

Other influences exist: peers, media promotion, and prescriptive attitudes shape the instances where clipped forms catch on. Algeo (1991)^[1] remarks that most clippings meet initial resistance from prescriptivists who see clipping as a threat to "proper" language. But as the variant forms begin to show up more and more in younger speech and online, the resistance fades, and clipping comes to feel natural and can eventually find its way into dictionaries.

1.5 Research Gap and Study Objectives

Despite clear clipping typologies and observed productivity patterns, empirical work on clippings is scant for today's digital age English. Studies generally rested on dictionary entries or a few examples; there was a lack of corpus-based attempts at studying clippings systematically across various registers. Changes in clipping productivity and ways in which digital-origin clippings broaden their register continue to be underexplored. This paper aims to fill those gaps through a corpus-based analysis of 150 clipped forms drawn from three registers: informal conversation, digital communication, and professional discourse. The research explores the following:

- (1) The quantitative distribution of clipping types in contemporary English;
- (2) Register-specific patterns in clipping productivity;
- (3) Phonological patterns in stress preservation and syllable structure;
- (4) Factors influencing the acceptability and conventionalization of clipped forms.

II. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

The research takes a corpus-based approach to investigate the way clipping operates in modern English—as to where it appears with what degree of productivity. The research methodology combines a research paradigm based on number-driven analysis about the distribution of different clipping forms with a qualitative analysis of phonological

features characteristic of certain social registers. The research consists of a data collection of 150 clipped forms that have been subjected to analysis based on three aspects: those of forming, location, and phonology.

2.2 Data Collection

Data collection was conducted in a systematic manner with three major sources ranging from December 2024 to January 2025. Sources vary in context, ranging from communication contexts:

- Informal conversation rate (n=60): This data is collected from online communities such as Reddit and X/Twitter using search keywords from general clipping examples (for example, "prof," "exam," "dorm," "gym"). This dataset only included English-speaking natives aged 18-35 to represent general usage patterns for this dialect: informal English spoken by natives in their younger years.
- Digital communication register (n = 50): Online text messages from the internet forum sites of Reddit and specialized online forums, as well as text messages from instant messaging services and social media sites, were examined. This register represents the shorthand style of computer-mediated communication (CMC).
- Professional register (n = 40): The data consisted of professional vocabulary from the fields of medicine, academics, and technology, which were gathered from professional literature, online medical sites such as WebMD and Mayo Clinic, course catalogs, and technical manuals.

2.3 Classification Framework

Each clipped word was assigned into one of the structural types, as follows, based on Marchand's (1969)^[5] structural classification:

- Back-clipping (removing final elements, retaining initial elements; e.g., "ad" < "advertisement," "exam" < "examination");
- Fore-clipping (removing initial elements, retaining final elements; e.g., "phone" < "telephone," "plane" < "airplane");
- Middle-clipping (removing medial elements, retaining initial and final elements; e.g., "flu" < "influenza," "fridge" < "refrigerator");
- Complex-clipping (blending two or more clipping operations or other word formation processes; e.g.,

“perm” < “permanent wave,” “email” < “electronic mail”). Ambiguities were resolved by checking etymological references.

2.4 Analysis Procedure

The following variables were measured: structural type (categorized on the basis of a four-fold typology), syllabic structure (number of syllables in the source form and the clipped form), stress pattern maintenance (maintenance of the primary stress position in the clipped form of the source word), register distribution (primary registers of occurrence in communicative situations), semantic transparency (level of semantic retrievability from the clipped form), and frequency measures (relative frequency in the sample data set). Statistical analysis was carried out on the data to reveal the distribution of clipping types with respect to the context, with a view to finding any systematic distribution of the phonological structure. Chi-square tests were used on the data to find the statistical significance of the distribution of the data with respect to the register distribution, with a

significance level of $p < 0.05$.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the corpus analysis of 150 clipped forms and discusses these findings in the light of current morphological theory and research in sociolinguistics. It will be seen that the analysis reveals patterns in the productivity, register distribution, and phonology of clipping, supporting theoretical claims with evidence, as well as reflecting the particularities of English in the digital era.

3.1 Distribution of Clipping Types

An Analysis of clipped forms shows a hierarchical structure in the productivity of clipping. Back-clipping stands out as the most prominent structural form with a total of 102 instances or 68.0% of the data. Fore-clipping accounts for 27 instances or 18.0% of the data, while complex-clipping accounts for 15 instances or 10.0%. The middle-clipping form accounts for only 6 instances or 4.0% of the data.

Table 1: Distribution of Clipping Types in the Dataset

Clipping Type	Count	Percentage	Representative Examples
Back-clipping	102	68.0%	ad (advertisement), exam (examination), prof (professor), gym (gymnasium), lab (laboratory)
Fore-clipping	27	18.0%	phone (telephone), plane (airplane), bus (omnibus), chute (parachute)
Middle-clipping	6	4.0%	flu (influenza), fridge (refrigerator)
Complex-clipping	15	10.0%	perm (permanent wave), email (electronic mail), blog (weblog)
Total	150	100%	

The strong adherence to back-clipping (68%) follows Marchand's 1969 ordering and extends it into today's speaking practices. This is associated with two aspects of sound: the natural stress on every second syllable, which is typical of the English language, and maintaining perceptual distinctness. This is because the English language emphasizes the first syllable of native words and even borrowed ones that are well-integrated into their pronunciation. This is exactly what happens in back-clipping, where every other part is removed except the stressed beginning.

On a similar note, the limited usage of fore-clipping and middle clipping can also be inferred from the prosodic pattern of words. Fore clipping mostly takes place when a particular word has its starting syllable unstressed, often

consisting of roots taken from Latin or Greek words. For example, telephone to phone or omnibus to bus. This removal of unstressed letters or parts often preserves the significance of the dominant part of the letter. Middle clipping generally barely takes place due to possible modification of its morphological pattern, creating ambiguity regarding its interpretation.

3.2 Register Distribution Patterns

A comparison Productivity for clipping differed significantly across the three registers analyzed ($\chi^2 = 18.42$, $df = 6$, $p < .01$). In the informal, chatty form, a high percentage of clipped variants occurred (40.0%, $n = 60$), compared to online communication (33.3%, $n = 50$), and professional discourse (26.7%, $n = 40$).

Table 2: Distribution of Clipping Types Across Registers

Register	Back-clipping	Fore-clipping	Middle-clipping	Complex-clipping	Total
Informal	45 (75%)	9 (15%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)	60
Digital	30 (60%)	8 (16%)	2 (4%)	10 (20%)	50
Professional	27 (67.5%)	10 (25%)	1 (2.5%)	2 (5%)	40

Functioning in informal conversations, clipping is always eager to appear, and especially so is back-clipping, which occurs in around three-quarters of instances. Phrases such as prof (professor), dorm (dormitory), and gym (gymnasium) sneak into informal academic discourse as unmarked alternatives. Turning to online communication, the trends tend to be more clear, where complex-clipping occurs in around 20%—this is a much larger proportion than in other varieties. In formal discourse, fore-clipping is more prominent than others, occurring in about a quarter, and medical-related terms are behind the thrust.

There are those that are limited to specific contexts, in the sense that "prof" stays social, "dorm" and "gym" remain locked to the social register, while "lab" and "rehab" are maintained in the discourse of the medical register. However, "phone," "plane," and "bike" appear in all forms of contexts, adopting a generic form.

Such clipping patterns in terms of register demonstrate that morphological productivity in clipping is best understood by considering structure as well as other sociolinguistic factors. The professional register makes up only about 26.7% of the entire data, which represents around 40% in a non-professional setup—a detail which might uncover what clipping actually signifies in a social context.

Nevertheless, clipped variants are rather markers of solidarity, in-group membership, and immediacy. This links back to the findings by another researcher in 1992 about the social roles of colloquial language. Despite prof, dorm, and gym appearing no differently as clipped variants than register-unmarked variants such as phone or bike, they remain linkages within the context of relaxed academic environments. This implies acceptability can rely on more than pure sound.

Patterns of clipping associated with professionals demonstrate how clipping contributes to creating communities of specialized conversations. The clipping productivity of terms associated with medicine is remarkably large: lab, exam, rehab, and med – all of these

demonstrate shorthand expressiveness. Nevertheless, other examples include phone, plane, bike, and these overpass different registers. These originally informal terms have long since been devoid of their negative connotations and are now neutralized by their usage over prolonged periods of time.

3.3 Phonological Patterns and Prosodic Optimization

The analysis of clipping based on phonology shows evident systemic patterns that reveal restrictions regulating clipping productivity, and analyzing 102 examples of back-clipping, it was found that 89, or 87.3%, preserved the position of major stress from the original word.

Table 3: Syllabic Structure of Clipped Forms

Syllable Count	Number of Forms	Percentage
Monosyllabic	87	58.0%
Disyllabic	54	36.0%
Trisyllabic	9	6.0%

The majority (94%) shortened by one or two syllables. Only 6% retained three, but that was typically the case when shortening further would have obscured or destroyed the meaning of the word.

The finding that 87% of back-clipped forms retain the primary stress position of the source word provides quantitative support for Cannon's (1987) ^[3]claim that English clippings adhere to prosodic optimization principles. This pattern demonstrates that clipping operates according to systematic phonological constraints rather than arbitrary truncation. In preserving the stressed syllables themselves, clipping maintains those aspects of words which are most perceptually significant in terms of their phonology. In shortening toward mostly one- and two-syllable words (about 94% of the data), it shows English prefers short patterns in word length. Such patterns are in keeping with unmarked English footing patterns, which suggests that clipping patterns are being adapted to preferred templates and are more to do with optimizing the phonology of words to fit preferred templates than purely to do with subtracting phonological objects. In this regard, it

all suggests that morphological operations are circumscribed by considerations of phonological well-formedness and thus firmly slot clipping as part of an otherwise normal phonological system for English.

3.4 Digital Communication and Accelerated Conventionalization

In online communities, there was an attendant digital talk that had its own set of characteristic signs, determined by the possibilities afforded by computer-mediated environments. Looking at the evolution of digital-origin clip shortenings such as "app" for application, "blog" for weblog, and "pic" for picture, several patterns emerge:

Rapid standardization: The clipped forms were quickly adopted and became widespread within 5 to 10 years, and this contrasts with old clipped forms such as "phone," "plane," which took many years to become standard words.

Transitioning to other sectors: Take the digital clippings. They began with a casual online focus but soon found their place in other, more formal areas. Today, 'app' appears in business communication, academic writing, and even in large dictionaries (starting in approximately 2010). 'Blog' also demonstrates a parallel transition. It has become a word adaptable to a range of journalism or academic levels.

Increased use of complex clipping: Complex clipping is even more prevalent in digital communication, occurring 20% as much as it does in other registers, often in combinations that incorporate clipping, blending, and other combinations of word formation tricks, such as "email," "blog," and "podcast."

Such unique patterns emerge as the most conspicuous lesson of the research, which indicates the great potential of computer-mediated platforms in new word creation. The pace of the embrace of digitized clipping can be accounted for by the confluence of the following factors:

Frequency: Certain words occur with fabulous regularity on digital sites. Consider the example of the word "app" itself—thousands of instances occur daily worldwide, and this not only causes phonetic reduction but accelerates community familiarity with the shortened form as well.

Global accessibility: Unlike older clipped forms which traveled along local networks of speech, digital clips reach a global audience instantly. Such rapid attention accelerates a process of normalization as everyone in the world starts using and fossilizing identical forms around the same time.

Functional need: New technologies gave rise to new entities like "blog" and "email," which demanded new words. Here, new words did not only provide different expressions of existing ideas but also filled gaps in the vocabulary, leading to a quicker acceptance and institutionalization of the innovations.

Digital clipping across different registers opposes the traditional understanding of informality and clipping being inextricably connected to one another, as if digital communication were to introduce unique linguistic patterns as anticipated by Crystal (2008)^[4]. Use of words such as "app" and "blog," for example, in formal business language as well as in academia illustrates how contemporary digital technology facilitates moving informal language innovations towards a register-neutral zone in a short time. This trend suggests that digital communication has emerged as a force competing with traditional prestige language to determine language standards.

3.5 Semantic Transparency and Acceptability

It was revealed that semantic transparency and register variability are interrelated. If a clipped form has a high level of semantic transparency, one that makes the relationship between the clipped and full forms apparent, then that form is generally accepted in a variety of registers.

High transparency forms (register-neutral):

- "bike" (bicycle) - morphological relationship clear
- "phone" (telephone) - phonological connection transparent
- "plane" (airplane) - semantic association immediate

Low transparency forms (register-restricted):

- "flu" (influenza) - historical relationship obscure to contemporary speakers
- "cab" (cabriolet) - etymological connection lost
- "bus" (omnibus) - Latin origin not recoverable from English phonology

This is clear in that it shows semantic retrieval is what influences the likelihood of clipping being widely accepted outside of informal talking. Opaque variations are marked as being informal, but transparent variations may become conventional in any number of communication situations. This is consistent with Algeo's argument^[1] in 1991 about new morphology being at first resisted by prescriptivists, but being used and having meaning helps gain acceptance.

3.6 Theoretical Implications

The study feeds into ongoing debates about the place of clipping in word formation. Although Bauer (1983)^[2] referred to clipping as a “minor” process, the high frequency and clear, patterned behavior evidenced here suggest that clipping functions as a productive morphological operation in contemporary English, particularly in casual and online speech.

The data point to a multifactorial view of morphological productivity that blends structural constraints-phonological wellformedness and prosodic ease-with sociolinguistic factors such as register suitability, social meaning, and how often a form appears. Clipping's productivity isn't something you can predict from sound rules or the meaning of the source word alone; it comes from the intersection of linguistic form, communicative purpose, and social evaluation.

Noticeably, stress patterns are retained to a great extent 87%, and the majority of forms tend towards optimal prosodic shapes 94% are one- or two-syllable. This demonstrates that even a simplified process operates within a bounded linguistic system. It challenges the idea of clipping as mere random abbreviation and instead places it within the standard phonological and morphological framework of English.

3.7 Limitations and Future Research Directions

First, the dataset (n=150) is modest. Larger corpora would produce more robust analysis.

Second, the study examined only written clipped forms. Phonetic and acoustic analysis of speech could reveal how clipping emerges from casual reduction. Third, while register variation was noted, individual sociolinguistic differences (age, gender, region, class) were not systematically studied. Fourth, the analysis was synchronic; diachronic tracking of clipping from emergence to lexicalization would clarify pathways of change.

Future research directions include:

1. Cross-linguistic comparison to test the universality of observed constraints.
2. Psycholinguistic studies on the cognitive processing of clipped forms.
3. Computational modeling of clipping patterns in large corpora.
4. Social media analytics to trace rapid

conventionalization online.

5. Pedagogical research on how second language learners acquire and use clipped forms appropriately.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper goes in-depth into the concept of clipping as a productive procedure which is currently practiced by the English language to construct new lexical entries, exploring the topic through the analysis of 150 examples found in different registers. The findings support theoretical propositions concerning the role of phonology, morphology, and sociolinguistics in clipping, while pointing to specific contemporary characteristics of the language of the digital age.

The data reveals that back-clipping is the most frequent type, constituting 68%, followed by fore-clipping at 18%, followed by complex-clipping at 10%, while middle-clipping comes fourth at 4%. The ranking matches the sound phonological patterns, particularly the prominence of a stress syllable in a focus-marked category. It is also important to note that a significant 87% of back-clipped variants retain the principal stress in the clipped word. This indicates that clipping is a principled phenomenon rather than a random process. This adds weight to the claim that it is a rule-based morphological phenomenon.

In the aspect of register, the variation in the distribution of clippings is quite evident. For instance, in the aspect of informal talk, the highest percentage of clippings is 40%, followed by digital communication at 33%, while in professional discourse, the percentage is 27%. Therefore, clippings can be seen as double-edged as they are used as quicker speech/typing assistance as well as social identity markers. In this regard, some clippings retain their connection to the context in which they are used as social markers within an in-group in informal contexts or as markers of technical know-how in professional contexts. However, other clippings tend to widen their scope to the extent that they are used in all contexts and in all kinds of discourse, as is the case of words like "phone", "plane", or "bike".

The study highlights how digital communication patterns are shaping the linguistic landscape. Terms born of digital life, such as "app," "pic," "blog," and "email," have made

the journey from novelty to common usage in just 5 to 10 years, considerably faster than earlier slang or clippings did. This brisk normalization contrasts with the slow, decades-long uptake seen in the case of earlier words. The speed is linked to what computer-mediated communication enables: ultra-high usage frequency, instant global spread, clear meaning, and the practical need for new labels as technology creates new referents. The finding that digital talk exhibits a noticeably high rate of complex clippings, at about 20%, suggests that online platforms serve as hotbeds for linguistic experimentation, generating forms that can rapidly shake off their casual origins and achieve formal traction.

4.1 Theoretical Contributions

This research contributes to morphological theory in numerous ways.

Firstly, it provides empirical evidence for phonological structure, semantic transparency, and sociolinguistics influencing clipping productivity, along with effects of frequency. The data support a multifactorial model of morphological productivity that integrates structural linguistic constraints with socially situated language use.

Second, the study points out the importance of clipping as an ongoing fruitful method of word-formation in present-day English, in online communication in particular. Although the classical morphology considers it to be of limited scope, it is characterized by great productiveness and adaptability to communication needs, which makes one question the classification of this type of morphology.

Third, it has been found that there exists a definite phonological pattern regarding clipping, in particular as concerns stress and prosodic optimization. Such findings firmly locate clipping in a signal system in English phonology and morphology.

4.2 Final Remarks

Clipping shows the dynamic nature of language as a system simultaneously restricted by structural rules and responsive to communication requirements. As English continues to evolve in increasingly digitalized global contexts, clipping will likely remain a very productive method for lexical innovation, yielding forms that balance phonological naturalness, semantic transparency, and functional efficiency. The patterns reported in this study provide a foundation for future research tracking morphological

change in real time, probing the cognitive mechanisms governing clipping creation and comprehension, and researching cross-linguistic variance in word-formation processes. By demonstrating how clipping occurs across multiple registers and communication situations, this research contributes to larger understanding of morphology as a systematic, adaptive, and socially placed component of linguistic knowledge.

REFERENCES

- [1] Algeo, J. (1991). *Fifty Years Among the New Words: A Dictionary of Neologisms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Cry, G. (1987). *Historical Change and English Word-Formation*. New York: Peter Lang.
- [4] Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- [5] Marchand, H. (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation* (2nd ed.). Munich: C. H. Beck.
- [6] McArthur, T. (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [7] Plag, I. (2003). *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.